

The Alliance for Progress Was Not Supposed to Buy Latin American Troops for Vietnam

"It is difficult to understand the legal right which the U.S. professes in extending an invitation to Latin American countries to join us in the fighting in Vietnam. . . . The pressures exerted by the U.S. . . . will seriously retard the Alliance for Progress and cast doubt upon its very objectives. Our neighbors to the south . . . have a long way

to go in correcting the social and economic inequalities with which they are beset. . . . We should not be encouraging them to spend additional sums in the empty gestures of 'showing the flag' in a war not of their concern thousands of miles away."

—Gruening (D. Alaska), in the Senate Jan. 15.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 3

JANUARY 25, 1965



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

It's Been A Faked Class B Movie From the Beginning

Associated Press correspondent Peter Arnett drove south of Saigon Jan. 14 to check reports of a battle and found U.S. Information Officers staging fake war scenes for a propaganda film. "We don't want to show cruel things like bodies," an information officer in charge explained, "And we will avoid references to tanks, fighter aircraft and artillery. This is a people-to-people film. . . ." When the story broke, the film was, of course, disavowed by USIA Director Carl T. Rowan. Only those with short memories will be taken in by the disavowal. The Vietnamese war, as far as the information given the American people is concerned, has been a faked class B movie from the beginning. The Moss subcommittee of the House two years ago protested the information practices of the State Department on Vietnam. It called attention to a speech by Mr. Rowan in which he spoke of the public's "right *not* to know in a period of undeclared war." Even this cynical statement misstated the facts. What is involved is not just "the right *not* to know" but the government's right to deceive. President Kennedy himself (see box on p. 3) tried at one point to get a New York Times man transferred from Vietnam because he was reporting the war too independently for the government's taste.

Doctoring The Record

Every agency of government is drawn into this campaign of deception. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week put out what purported to be an objective volume of "Background Information" on the war in Vietnam. It is supposed to be a compilation of the important official statements. But the record is tailored. The fullest official reports to the public on the war were the Blue Book the State Department issued in the Fall of 1961 to explain Kennedy's decision to intervene; Secretary Rusk's speech to the Economic Club in New York April 22, 1963, and Secretary McNamara's speech to the National Security Industrial Association (an arms lobby mouthpiece) on March 26 of last year. All three pictured South Vietnam under Diem as a model of progress and democracy, an "economic miracle" comparable to West Germany (no less!), a land of such contented people (land reform, educational expansion) that the Communists in desperation resorted to invasion as their only hope of reunifying the country. This notion that guerrilla war can successfully be carried on in a prosperous country, amid a happy people, is so preposterous

The Wild Far East and The Wild Far West

"Americans in Asia are basically aliens, of a different race, religion and culture. Moreover, the Vietnamese are nationalistic and race-conscious in their outlook. As one on-the-scene observer pointed out, 'If you imagine a Chinese Sheriff speaking Cantonese and trying to keep order in Tombstone, Arizona, in its heyday, you will begin to get the problem.'"

—McGovern (D. S. Dak.) in the Senate Jan. 15.

that even a public as doped-up as ours could no longer be expected to take it seriously. In the Foreign Relations handbook not a scrap remains of the two-volume Blue Book. Rusk's speech has disappeared altogether. Discreet editorial scissors have cut out of McNamara's speech the whole opening section with its glowing picture of what McNamara called the Vietnamese "success story." Why should the Foreign Relations Committee, which is supposed to provide some check on the State Department, help to hide this record of deception?

Even Senators Uninformed

Even members of Congress, who get private briefings, show an extraordinary ignorance of what has been going on. McGovern of South Dakota made a good speech in the Senate Jan. 15. It echoed de Gaulle's suggestion that the war be ended by negotiating the neutralization of the area. McGovern opposed expansion of the war. "Attacks on North Vietnam," he said, "will not seriously weaken guerrilla fighters a thousand miles away, fighters who depend for 80% of their weapons on captured U.S. equipment and for food on a sympathetic local peasantry." But then he went on to make a suggestion which shows how little Senators are told. He said that "the most practical way" to put pressure on North Vietnam was "quietly through infiltration and subversion by South Vietnamese units" into the North with the aim not of "military victory" but of "bringing Ho Chi Minh to the negotiating table."

This is doubly ludicrous. Ho Chi Minh has been trying to get to the bargaining table for two years. The problem is to get the United States to the bargaining table. He has made clear his readiness to accept a neutralized independent South Vietnam in return for peace and resumption of North-South

(Continued on Page Four)

RR Nationalization: For the First Time in Years A Radical Proposal from U. S. Labor

"I Ain't Got Much Confidence in Mississippi Doing Anything Right"

For years the FBI and the Justice Department have excused slack follow-through on Civil Rights complaints against police brutality in the South on the grounds that indictments and convictions could not be obtained. The arrests in the murder of the Martyred Three in Philadelphia, Miss., show that if enough evidence is mustered, Southern grand juries will sometimes indict. Maybe petit juries will convict. In any case what is happening to the Sheriff of Neshoba county and his deputy puts similar types in the South on notice that the murder and beating of Negroes and civil rights workers may not be quite as safe as it used to be. Still we hold our breath and agree with the redoubtable Mrs. Lillie Jones who keeps a shotgun handy in Philadelphia, Miss. She told Homer Bigart (*N.Y. Times* Jan. 17), "I ain't got much confidence in Mississippi doing anything right."

Public Ownership Long Overdue

The railroad brotherhoods have let a fresh breath of air in on a stale problem by demanding nationalization of the railroads. The glamorous improvement in service between Boston and Washington, on which the President touched in his State of the Union message, is impossible under present management. The railroads have too long been in the hands of a banker-lawyer bureaucracy devoid of business enterprise. At the end of World War I, the entire labor movement and many farm organizations campaigned for public ownership, under the once famous Plumb Plan. "A low degree of managerial skill," Glenn E. Plumb wrote about his plan in *The Nation* (Aug. 16, 1919), "cannot be taken into account at a rate-hearing." A great national resource has been plundered and run down by incapable hands.

Congress may soon authorize four new judges for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals which covers the deep South. These with two vacancies on the present bench will make way for six new appointments, and may change the character of this hitherto liberal court, on which civil rights enforcement so much depends. Negro organizations are petitioning for the nomination of Clifford Durr of Montgomery, Alabama, an outstanding Southern liberal, one-time New Dealer and ex-FCC Commissioner for the Court. Unless pressure is built up, all the new appointments may go to segregationists.

An Echo of McCarthyism

At the end of a first-rate speech in the Senate Jan. 12 on the radical right by Church of Idaho, Morse boasted that in 1954 he co-sponsored a bill to outlaw Communism "which is the law of the land today." This referred to a shameful incident of the McCarthy period. The right-wingers had put in a bill to subject labor unions to the Subversive Activities Control Board. Most of the liberals were afraid to oppose it directly. They offered as substitute a bill to outlaw the Communist party. When this maneuver failed, they accepted both the original bill and their amendments. The purpose, as Morse said on the Senate floor at the time, was "to remove any doubt as to where we stand on the issue of communism." The law was never applied because so loosely written as to be clearly unconstitutional. It defined membership in the Communist Party so broadly that the liberal sponsors could themselves have been outlawed under it. They made it unlawful to indicate "by word, action, conduct, writing or in any other way a willingness to carry out in any manner and in any degree" Communist "plans, designs, objectives or purposes." This is broad enough to label Morse a Communist for advocating withdrawal from Vietnam. Only Kefauver and John Sherman Cooper had the nerve to oppose this cowardly nonsense at the time. We did not expect to hear Morse boast of it.

The appointment of freshman Congressman John Conyers (*D. Mich.*) to the House Judiciary Committee is auspicious for civil rights. Conyers is a Negro lawyer from Detroit who worked last year in the Mississippi Summer Project. Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer went to Detroit to campaign for him. . . . The assignment of Maurine Neuberger (*D. Ore.*) to the Senate Commerce Committee strengthens the hand of its chairman, Magnuson (*D. Wash.*) in his campaign to put a cigarette labelling bill through Congress. . . . We applaud Dom Bonafede for his story in the *New York Herald-Tribune* Jan. 14 exposing the close connections between W. Ellis Meehan, chief investigator for the Senate Rules Committee in the Baker inquiry, and Thomas D. Webb, friend of Bobby Baker's and Washington man for the Murchison empire. . . . We mourn the death of our old friend, Fowler Harper of Yale Law School, a lifelong fighter for civil liberties.

Why Is The Supreme Court So Timid When Confronted With The First Amendment?

Mr. Justice Stewart's opinion for a unanimous court in the case of *Stanford v. Texas* last Monday was disappointingly narrow. Stanford did a mail order book business in San Antonio under the trade name, "All Points of View." His premises were raided and some 2,000 of his books and pamphlets seized. The raid took place under the Texas Communist Control Law of 1951. The search warrant was issued in response to an affidavit by two Assistant Attorneys General of Texas asserting that mailings by Stanford of "pro-Communist material and other information received in the course of investigation" indicated that Stanford "has in his possession the books and records of the Texas Communist Party." A four hour search turned up no such records but the police made off as consolation with the works of suspect authors as diverse as Marx, Sartre, Pope John and Justice Black.

The conviction was attacked on First Amendment grounds as an invasion of political freedom. But the Court chose instead to rule under the Fourth amendment which makes search and seizure under general warrants unconstitutional. This gave Mr. Justice Stewart occasion for much romantic rhetoric about James Otis and John Wilkes and how in Tudor England general writs were used "to suppress and destroy the literature of dissent." But all the Court ruled in ordering Stanford's books returned is that "the constitutional requirement that warrants must particularly describe the 'things to be seized' is to be accorded the most scrupulous exactitude when the 'things' are books." So what if the Texas warrant had asked to seize Marx's Capital or Lenin's Imperialism? Would that have made the seizure constitutional? How pusillanimous to leave the question open.

Almost 40% of the School Funds Will Go to Eleven Southern States

Johnson Combines Political Shrewdness and Humanity in Education Program

The President's education program combines shrewdness and humanity. It is Mr. Johnson at his best, and there is every reason to be grateful. His program aims to improve our education system where it is now most deficient, at the elementary and secondary level. Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy all failed at this, although they did win aid for higher and vocational education. President Johnson almost surely will succeed, but not because he is handing out little scraps for everyone. His bill concentrates federal funds in proportion to poverty. Suburbs will generally get less than urban and rural centers; Southern and industrial states will get more than those of the Middle West and West. Perhaps most refreshing is that for once the main theme of a Presidential education message was really education, not national security.

Winning Over Southerners and Catholics

There are compromises in his bill, but these strengthen rather than mar it. In the past, a coalition of Republicans, Dixiecrats and Catholics have blocked federal aid to lower education. The President's program is designed to win support from the latter two. Almost 40% of the funds will go to eleven Southern states. This results from drawing the poverty line at family incomes of \$2,000, a level which includes most of the Southern rural poor but excludes many poor Northerners whose incomes tend to group in the \$3,000 range. It would be wrong to see this as only a gimmick to win Southern votes. It is also a way to focus aid on the South's poor whites and Negroes. If they can be made to share it together, the education bill will mean a leap forward for both the mind and the spirit of the South. The bill's compromise with Catholics is also to the general good. It permits parochial school students to attend supplementary educational centers along with public school students. Here is an opportunity to let fresh air into minds that all too frequently have been closed and retarded.

If the education bill is encouraging in what it sets out to do, it is depressing in what it reveals about the extent of poverty in America. The bill entitles a school district to federal aid when either 3% or 100 of its school-age children come from families with annual incomes less than \$2,000. An informa-

Inequities of the Wheat Program

Wheat products are among the major food items in the diet of the poor. In a country with as many sources of revenue as this one, there seems to be little excuse for a tax on wheat, especially one that amounts to 50% of the price of every bushel. There is even less excuse for such a tax if most of its proceeds go directly into the pockets of some of the wealthiest farmers in the United States. Yet this is exactly what is happening under the wheat certificate program that passed Congress last year with the help of President Johnson. A farm subsidy like this one is supposed to aid poor farmers producing for glutted markets. In a House speech last week, Rep. Paul Findley (R., Ill.) revealed that the \$350 million raised by the wheat tax will be parcelled out so that 1,300 big wheat farmers receive payments averaging \$15,000 per farmer while small farmers—over a million of them—receive payments averaging only \$58. Still worse, less than one-third of wheat farmers have agreed to participate. Most of the really small farmers, the 15-acre ones, refused because participation would have required taking too much of their already scarce land out of production. The President in his State of the Union message spoke of the need "to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most." The wheat tax program would be a fine place to start.

tion sheet released with the bill explains that school districts in 95% of the counties in the United States will qualify for aid under this formula. This is appalling. It means that poverty is not regional but nationwide; that our economy is fundamentally out-of-joint, and that it, not ignorance, is the taproot of poverty. It means also that unless the President is as imaginative and earnest in creating jobs as in educating children, America may soon be confronted by a generation of poor young people who because they are better educated will be even more frustrated.

The President's higher education bill has not been drafted yet, but his message lacked any indication of a request to broaden the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This permits federal funds for facilities in science, math, engineering and foreign language, but none for the social sciences and humanities.

How the White House Tried to Discourage Independent Reporting From Vietnam

In the January issue of Commentary, David Halberstam of the New York Times tells how the Kennedy Administration tried to discredit and silence independent reporters in Vietnam. A coordinated attack on Halberstam himself began in September 1963. Here is part of his story:

"In early September, a friend sent me a column from the New York Journal-American in which I was accused of being soft on Communism and of preparing the way for a Vietnamese Fidel Castro. A few days later, Joseph Alsop, after a brief visit to Vietnam, attacked a group of 'young crusaders' in the Saigon press corps. . . . The President's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, and other White House staff members more interested in their chief's political standing at home than in the status of the war in Vietnam, would knowingly inform White House reporters that we in Vietnam never went on operations. At the Penta-

gon, in the higher reaches where the realities of the war rarely penetrated, the criticism was particularly vehement. 'It's a damn good thing you never belonged to any left-wing groups or anything like that,' a friend of mine high up in the State Department told me after I left Saigon, 'because they were really looking for stuff like that.'

"On October 22, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, the new publisher of the Times, went by the White House to pay a courtesy call on the President. Almost the first question the President asked Mr. Sulzberger was what he thought of his young man in Saigon. The President suggested that perhaps I was too close to the story, too involved. The President asked if perhaps Mr. Sulzberger had been thinking of transferring me to another assignment. No, said Mr. Sulzberger, the Times was quite satisfied with the present distribution of assignments."

That Bridge at Ban Ban Was No "Bridge Over the River Kwai"

(Continued from Page One)

trade (see Bernard Fall's *The Two Vietnams*). The idea of using commando raids on the North for "infiltration and subversion" which McGovern recommends is not new. There is evidence* that such raiding operations were begun 10 years ago when our leading counter-guerrilla expert, Gen. Lansdale, was Diem's military adviser. These operations represent a major political and military defeat. The infiltrates have never succeeded in sparking local anti-Communist guerrilla uprisings. Richard Dudman of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reported a year ago (Feb. 26, 1964) that officials were disillusioned about infiltrating the North. "Although it is not generally known," Mr. Dudman wrote, "special South Vietnamese troops already have been parachuted into North Vietnam on missions of espionage and sabotage. They have vanished."

How We Broke The Geneva Pact

These cloak-and-dagger activities, which began five years before fighting broke out in the South, were a violation by the United States of the Geneva agreement of 1954. Though we did not sign the agreement, we pledged ourselves not to upset neutralization of the area by force. The training and supply of those early commando raids violated that pledge. So did our Programs Evaluation Office in Laos, a disguised military mission of U.S. officers in civilian clothes who took over control of the armed forces in Laos in the same period. They twice engineered the overthrow of its neutralist Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma and are still at it.

It is a pity Chairman Fulbright of Senate Foreign Relations does not take time off from retailing safe liberal generalities about easily discernible "myths" and use his committee to give the U.S. public a thorough investigation of what is going on. We went to the conference table in Geneva in 1962 to save Laos from being completely taken over by the Left when our rightist military proteges faced collapse. The price was an agreement to neutralize the country and to establish a

* See Edgar Ansel Mowrer's boastful account in the *Paris* magazine, *Realités*, May 1964, and Georges Chaffard's sober account of these activities in *Le Monde*, Aug. 7, 1964.

While We "Blast Supply Lines" 1,000 Miles to The North

Before retreating from Tan Buu, the Viet Cong stole all the weapons from the armory, carried away so much ammunition they could not paddle it all down the river, and even swiped the commander's boots and uniforms. They captured four heavy weapons and enough rifles to equip a new company; three American-supplied radios, which enables them to listen to radio communications of government forces; classified documents, and even a government trooper's hammock. . . . 'The Viet Cong has now the same weapons that we have,' an American adviser lamented after the attack. It appears we are equipping both sides. . . . The attack was made in an area supposedly pacified under the Hop Tac Plan, designed by Gen. Westmoreland, commander of American forces in Vietnam and approved by Secretary of Defense McNamara. The plan, using Saigon as the center of the so-called 'oil spot,' calls for gradual expansion of government authority into the six provinces around Saigon."

—Beverly Deepe, *New York Herald-Tribune*, Jan. 17, describing an attack made just 10 miles outside Saigon.

coalition government of the three factions under Souvanna Phouma. The aerial bombardment of Laos now coming to public knowledge with the loss of more planes to enemy action was made possible by the overthrow of Souvanna Phouma for the third time last April. Though he was restored, the conditions were such as to make him and the neutralists prisoners of the right. With the coalition destroyed, the way was clear to escalate the war by having the Laotian government invite the U.S. to send its planes into Laos for "reconnaissance." This violated the promises made at Geneva in 1962. Laos offers an ideal way to satisfy the demand for escalation without direct attacks on North Vietnam or China. The recent bombings, notably that on the bridge at Ban Ban, have been overplayed in the U.S. press. Our public, brought up on movies about the bridge across the River Kwai, pictures Ban Ban as a jugular attack. But this bridge is not anywhere near that legendary Ho Chi Minh supply trail to South Vietnam, and bridges are of little importance anyway in small scale guerrilla fighting. This is another phony "movie" about the war.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

1/25/65

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.